

REMARKS

This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated August 15, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application.

I. Rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Larose et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,420; hereinafter "Larose").

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

A packaged content structure for authenticating a content provider and assuring content integrity, comprising:

an encrypted content portion; and

a header comprising an address from which a certificate of the content provider can be acquired.

The Examiner asserts that col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 15 of Larose teaches the elements of claim 1. The aspects of Larose cited by the Examiner disclose a one-step process where a cryptographic signature is ascertained for an original distribution file and embedded data. Larose also discloses a two-step process where a cryptographic signature of embedded data produced similarly to the one-step process is then embedded into the original distribution file. The original distribution file, embedded data, and an embedded data cryptographic signature are then input to a second cryptographic step where an overall cryptographic signature is ascertained. The two-step process augments the capabilities of the system and method to authenticate and detect tampering in the software application installed on the installation computer.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion that a header comprises an address from which a certificate of the content provider can be acquired, as claimed.

For at least the above claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites “an electronic signature made through hash coding of predetermined parts of the header and encrypted content portion so as to assure the integrity of the packaged contents.” The Examiner cites col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 15 of Larose for teaching this aspect of the claim. Larose discloses applying a one-way hash function to the original distribution file 130 and data to be embedded 140 producing a cryptographic fingerprint. The cryptographic fingerprint is then encrypted using a private key and a public/private encryption function. See col. 7, line 3 to col. 8, line 27. The original distribution file 130 is assumed to have a structure including header information and different types of internal sections for code, static data, and so on. See col. 6, lines 55-60.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Larose that an electronic signature is made through hash coding of predetermined parts of the header and the encrypted content portion. It appears that Larose suffers from the same deficiencies in the related art as discussed in para. [08] of the Applicant’s specification. Specifically that the related art makes an electronic signature only through hash coding of the header. Consequently, claim 2 should be deemed allowable.

Claim 4

Claim 4 recites “wherein the header comprises a content provider’s name, a content ID, a license provider’s URL, and meta-information.” The Examiner asserts that col. 5, lines 21-23 of Larose teaches this aspect of the claim. The aspect of Larose cited by the Examiner discloses that a user installation agent (UIA) 200 accepts data input from a user such as name, address,

payment options and data pertaining to the acceptance of an end-user license. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that a header comprise a content provider's name, a content ID, a license provider's URL, and meta-information, as claimed. For at least the above reasons, claim 4 should be deemed allowable.

II. Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larose as applied to claim 1 and 2. Claim 3 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. The Examiner takes Official Notice that the elements of claim 3 are well known to anyone having skill in the art of security systems. However, Applicant submits that the elements of claim 3 are not well known. Further, where the Applicant traverses a taking of Official Notice, the Examiner should cite evidentiary support. MPEP 2144.03C. Further, Larose does not appear to teach or suggest hash coding an encrypted content portion, let alone, that only some of the encrypted content portion are hash coded and then included in the electronic signature.

Consequently, claim 3 should be deemed allowable.

III. Rejection of claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larose. To the extent claims 5-8 recite subject matter similar to claims 1-4, claims 5-8 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, the Examiner takes Official Notice that the elements of claim 5-7 are well known in the art of security systems. However, Applicant submits that the elements of claims 5-7 are not well known. Further, where the Applicant traverses a taking of Official Notice, the Examiner should cite evidentiary support. MPEP 2144.03C. Consequently, claims 5-8 should be deemed allowable.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: November 15, 2007